



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/580,120

09/11/2006

Frank Henglein

P/746-4

7418

2352 7590 12/31/2008
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100368403

EXAMINER

PARVINI, PEGAH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1793

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/31/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The rejection of claims 1-36 and 39-43 under Title 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Schmid et al. in view of Andes et al. as generally set forth in the previous Office Action is proper and stands.

Response to Amendment

Applicants' amendment to claims 6-10, 15 and 29, filed September 17, 2008 is acknowledged. As such, the objection made to said claims are hereby withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed September 17, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With reference to Applicants' argument drawn to the "chemical wet-oxidation" in claim 1, it is noted that said claim is a product-by-process claim; it is well settled that the limitations directed to the method for producing a claimed composition in a product claim are not considered to add patentable weight to the examination of the product claims. Further, it is well settled that if the examiner can find a product in the prior art that is the same or so similar to have been obvious, the burden can be shifted to the Applicants to demonstrate that the process for producing the composition somehow imparts a patentable distinction to the composition under examination.

It should be noted, however, that the process limitations were addressed in pages 6-8 of the previous Office Action which are incorporated herein by reference.

With reference to Applicants' argument that the process imparts significant difference in structure and appearance of the pigments and the submission of the declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed September 17, 2008, it is to be noted that said declaration is not sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-36 and 39-43 based upon the fact that the declaration is not commensurate with the scope of the claims. The structure appearance and optical properties as has been detailed out in the declaration is not claimed in instant claims. In addition, the declaration does not outline what the specific steps of Schmid are as compared to the claimed method steps. It is to be noted that this reference details many embodiments and absence of the specific embodiments for which applicants declaration is relying upon does not sufficiently establish evidence of a structural appearance. Finally, it is to be noted that this reference uses a solvent, water, (claimed oxidizing agents), catalyst, etc. and processes this mixture at a similar temperature (reflux temperature), thus if the same materials are used at the same temperature, it is the examiners position that the same effect will be apparent and applicants have not shown sufficient evidence to the contrary.

Again, it should be noted that the process limitations claimed in the instant application have been addressed in pages 6-8 of the previous Office Action; therefore, any properties and characteristics detailed by the Applicants in the Remarks and Declaration to be associated with the product obtained from performing the process and

Art Unit: 1793

process steps recited in instant application is considered to follow from the product obtained by the combination of Schmid et al. in view of Andes et al.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PEGAH PARVINI whose telephone number is (571)272-2639. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1793

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 1793

/Michael A Marcheschi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793